

**REMARKS**

The Final Office Action mailed January 12, 2004, and the Advisory Action mailed on March 31, 2004, have been received and reviewed. Claims 1 through 11, and 16 through 18 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1 through 3, 7, 8, 10 and 11 stand rejected. Claims 4 through 6, and 9 have been objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims, but the indication of allowable subject matter in such claims is noted with appreciation.

Applicants previously provided a response to the Final Office Action (mailed March 11, 2004) in which no amendments were proposed.

Per this response, Applicants propose to amend claim 1, cancel claim 9, and respectfully request reconsideration of the application as amended herein.

**35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Anticipation Rejections**

Anticipation Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 3,484,534 to Kilby et al.

Claims 1 through 3, 7, 8, 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Kilby et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,484,534). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Independent claim 1, as proposed to be amended herein, is directed to a method of fabricating an integrated circuit package. The method comprises: providing a semiconductor die having a plurality of conductive pads; forming a leadframe including at least two conductors, each conductor of the at least two conductors having a first end and a second end and a generally arcuate-shaped portion between the first and second ends, at least a portion of each generally arcuate-shaped portion exhibiting a constant radius; *configuring and positioning the at least two conductors such that line spacing between the each of the at least two conductors is constant from their respective first ends to their respective second ends*; electrically coupling the first ends

of each of the at least two conductors with at least one of the plurality of conductive pads; and encapsulating the semiconductor die and at least a portion of the at least two conductors with an insulating material.

Applicants note that, in the body of Final Action, claims 1-3, 7-11, and 16 are stated as being anticipated by Kilby. However, the Examiner does not specifically apply the teachings of Kilby to claim 9. Additionally, in the Summary of the Final Action, and on page 3 of the Final Action, the Examiner indicates claim 9 as being objected to as depending from a rejected base claim but containing allowable subject matter. As such, it appears that the subject matter of claim 9 is considered by the Examiner to be allowable subject matter. The proposed amendment to claim 1 herein incorporates the allowable subject matter of claim 9. As such, Applicants submit that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Applicants further submit that claims 2, 3, 7, 8, 10 and 11 are also allowable as being dependent from an allowable base claim as well as for the additional patentable subject matter introduced thereby.

With respect to claim 3, Applicants maintain that Kilby fails to teach that forming the at least two conductors further comprises forming each generally arcuate-shaped portion of each of the at least two conductors to *exhibit a different arc length than any other generally arcuate-shaped portion of any other conductor of the at least two conductors*.

Applicants, therefore, respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 through 3, 7, 8, 10 and 11.

#### Claim 16

Applicants note that, in the body of Final Action, claims 1-3, 7-11, and 16 are stated as being anticipated by Kilby. However, the Examiner does not specifically apply the teachings of Kilby to claim 16. Additionally, in the Summary of the Final Action, and on page 3 of the Final Action, the Examiner indicates claim 16 as being allowed.

It appears to Applicants that claim 16 was not intended to be rejected by the Examiner based on the Kilby reference and, therefore, Applicants do not discuss claim 16 as compared to the device disclosed by Kilby.

**Objections to Claims 4 through 6, and 9/Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 4 through 6, and 9 stand objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims, but are indicated to contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if placed in appropriate independent form.

Applicants note that the subject matter of claim 9 has been incorporated into claim 1 per the proposed amendment. As such, Applicants submit that claim 1 is now in condition for allowance. Applicants further submit that claims 4 through 6 (which depend from claim 1), are also in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 4 through 6.

**ENTRY OF AMENDMENTS**

The proposed amendments to claim 1 above should be entered by the Examiner because the amendments are supported by the as-filed specification and drawings and do not add any new matter to the application. Further, the amendments do not raise new issues or require a further search. Finally, if the Examiner determines that the amendments do not place the application in condition for allowance, entry is respectfully requested upon filing of a Notice of Appeal herein.

**CONCLUSION**

Claims 1 through 8, 10, 11, and 16 through 18 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner determine that additional issues remain which might be resolved by a telephone conference, he is respectfully invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bradley B. Jensen", followed by a long horizontal flourish.

Bradley B. Jensen  
Registration No. 46,801  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
TRASKBRITT  
P.O. Box 2550  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550  
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: April 12, 2004  
BBJ/djp  
Document in ProLaw